DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 442 80 EA 008 827

AUTHOR	Nelsen, Edward A.; And Others
TITLE	The Imperative of Leadership V. A Report on Education of Disadvantaged and Minority Children: A Multicultural Perspective.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Boards of Education, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of State Agency Cooperation.; New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Jan 76
NOTE	17p.; Not available in hard copy due to small print size of original document
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of State Boards of Education, 810 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Board of Education Role; Citizen Participation; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Culturally Disadvantaged; *Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Secondary Education; *Guidelines; Parent School Relationship; *Program Planning; *State Boards of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title V; ESEA Title V

ABSTRACT

This booklet is one of a series of reports addressing the most critical issues confronting state boards of education throughout the United States. Each report attempts to present a concise, informative review and analysis of the best and most current information available on one of these critical topics. This booklet focuses on compensatory education programs for disadvantaged and minority children. Section 1 contains a brief overview and summary of the booklet; section 2 presents a review and analysis of goals and strategies for educating disadvantaged children by Edward A. Nelsen, Robert E. Grinder, and Morrison F. Warren; section 3 presents a number of action alternatives recommended by the staff of the National Association of State Boards of Education; and section 4 contains footnotes and a brief annotated bibliography prepared by the authors of section 2. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 3

SECTION I — OVERVIEW SUMMARY 4

SECTION II — EDUCATION OF ADVANTAGED AND MINORITY CHILDREN: A MULTICULTURAL PERSPECTIVE .. 5

SECTION III — ACTION ALTERNATIVES 13

SECTION IV — APPENDIX 15

ERRATA

The NASBE staff wishes to apologize for a publishing error in Volume V of The Imperative of Leadership series entitled "A Report on Education of Disadvantaged and Minority Children: A Multicultural Perspective." Unfortunately, the order of authorship credits for the article was improperly arranged. Dr. Edward A. Nelsen, associate director of the Center for Multicultural Education of the J.D. Payne Laboratory, was the principal author of the work. Therefore, Dr. Edward A. Nelsen's name should have preceded the names of Drs. Robert E. Grinder, associate dean of the College of Education at Arizona State University, and Morrison F. Warren, director of the Center for Multicultural Education of the J.D. Payne Laboratory. We recognize that the proper listing of credits is important for each of the author's professional records and for the proper citation in academic journals. Please attach this sheet to Volume V of The Imperative of Leadership series.

PREFACE

This report on *Education of Disadvantaged and Minority Children: A Multicultural Perspective* represents the fifth in a series of twelve papers on critical issues affecting state boards of education. Publication of these reports is made available to all NASBE members by funds provided by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505) provided through the state of New York.

This report is organized into four Sections. Section I contains an *Overview Summary* on the research text. Section II is the complete research text — *Education of Disadvantaged And Minority Children: A Multicultural Perspective.* Section III presents *Action Alternatives* developed by the NASBE staff. Section IV is the *Appendix* containing Footnotes and an Annotated Bibliography.

This organizational format was chosen to meet the needs of several types of readers. The *Overview Summary* is intended for the reader who is concerned with the subject but for various reasons does not wish to be burdened with detail. Sections II through IV (containing research text, pragmatic alternatives and review sources) are provided for the technical reader who wishes an indepth study of the topic.

NASBE wishes to express appreciation to the Center for Research and Education (CRE) in Denver who coordinated the research efforts and to Drs. Morrison F. Warren and Edward A. Nelson, director and associate director, respectively, of the Center for Multicultural Education of the I. D. Payne Laboratory, as well as Dr. Robert E. Grinder, associate dean of the College of Education at Arizona State University, who authored the research text on *Education of Disadvantaged and Minority Children: A Multicultural Perspective.*

James M. Connor

NASBE President

January 1976

Denver, Colorado

SECTION I — OVERVIEW SUMMARY

During the past 25 years federal agencies have provided the major impetus for programs to improve educational opportunities of disadvantaged and minority children. Although some successes have been achieved, many of the problems still persist. Such efforts were motivated primarily by commitment to the principle that all children have a fundamental right to equal educational opportunities, but this principle has been subject to many conflicting interpretations. And even many programs that did provide special resources to address the problem often did not demonstrate substantial or lasting academic benefits. Appraisals of early programs concluded that most of them failed to fulfill their hopes and promises. Many factors contributed to this failure, but most common perhaps was that desegregation and compensatory programs were designed, administered and staffed by persons who were not attuned to the realities and concerns of the people for whom the programs were operated.

Thus it is clear that commitment of financial and other resources is not enough to assure that all children are being *effectively* educated. Quality education can be achieved only when programs acknowledge that children of all socioeconomic levels and ethnic groups benefit from educational experiences that respect the diversity of cultural viewpoints and contributions to American society.

The following goal areas are proposed as a framework for planning future programs for disadvantaged and minority students:

- Minimize racial, cultural, and social isolation in the schools.
- Develop academic and nonacademic programs to involve the students.
- Involve parents in the educational process.
- Organize citizen participation in educational policy and decisions.
- Recruit, educate, and retrain teachers.
- Provide bilingual education for "language minority" pupils.
- Develop coherence and continuity within educational programs for migrant children.
- Allocate funds to improve educational opportunities for the disadvantaged.

State Boards vary considerably with respect to their power and authority, relationships with legislative bodies, staff and financial resources. Certainly the laws affecting the education of disadvantaged children vary from state to state. Nevertheless, State Board members are in a position to influence and facilitate program development in a number of ways, officially as an organization and unofficially in exerting their personal influence on state and federal legistlation, local school board policies and decisions, and public attitudes and support.

Although many programmatic strategies for attaining these goals must be developed and implemented at the local level, a State Board can encourage and support such activities by:

- Communicating and interpreting to educators the importance and significance of the school climate — that is, nonacademic problems and issues due to the cultural and economic backgrounds of minority and disadvantaged students — in their educational and social development.
- Studying the alternatives to busing as a means to achieve desegregation — or equal access to quality teachers, facilities, and programs.
- Influencing multicultural perspectives in textbooks and supplementary materials.
- Establishing a human relations division within the state education agency.
- Facilitating involvement of parents of minority and disadvantaged children in the educational process.
- Initiating guidelines for improved training and selection of teachers for such children.
- Determining the scope of need of "language minority" children within the state and coordinating planning for bilingual education.
- Coordinating planning on a regional basis for curriculum development, communications systems for the exchange of studen records, etc. for migrant children.

In summary: Federal approaches have been limited in effectiveness. The need is clear for State Boards of Education to take a stronger role in forumulating, implementing and coordinating programs and actions at the state and local levels. The basic posture of State Board members, collectively and individually, can influence state and local school officials, legislatures, and majority and minority citizen viewpoints. Therefore, as the state's leading educational policy makers, Board members should manifest their commitment to the principle of equal educational opportunity. Their attitudes will ultimately contribute to a climate in which lay and professional educators throughout the state commit themselves to the ideal of *effective* education for all children.

SECTION II — EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED AND MINORITY CHILDREN: A MULTICULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Morrison F. Warren and Dr. Edward A. Nelson, Director and Associate Director, respectively of the Center for Multicultural Education of the I. D. Payne Laboratory, and Dr. Robert E. Grinder, Associate Dean of the College of Education at Arizona State University.

Since 1950, federal agencies have provided the major impetus for programs to improve educational opportunities of disadvantaged and minority children. Beginning with **Brown v. Board of Education** in 1954, the Supreme Court has rendered a series of decisions which have provided a broad legal framework for public school desegregation. Congress passed the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1964 which provided legal, administrative, and financial means for implementing desegregation plans. Congressional legislation has also provided for desegregation assistance, compensatory education for the disadvantaged, bilingual education, and education of migrant children.

A broad array of programs has been developed and vast sums of money have been spent. Project Headstart and a number of experimental preschool programs, for example, were designed to enhance the intellectual abilities of disadvantaged children as they entered primary grades. Teacher Corps and the Career Opportunities Program were implemented to train teachers of disadvantaged children. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act has funded locally developed programs for the disadvantaged. The Emergency School Assistance Act funded a variety of programs to aid local school systems in solving problems associated with desegregation. And federal legislation has provided funds for state education agencies to develop programs to meet the special needs of migratory agricultural workers and to coordinate them with similar programs in other states.

Programs such as these, along with the efforts of state and local school authorities, have achieved some successes in expanding and improving the educational opportunities for minority and disadvantaged children. The percentage of blacks who had completed high school increased from 15 percent in 1950 to 44 percent in 1972. And the proportion of black youths between the ages of 18 and 24 attending college increased from less then five percent in 1950 to more than 18 percent in 1972. Moreover, the dual educational systems in the South were largely dismantled, and in 1972 less than ten percent of southern black pupils attended all-minority schools.[1]

Nevertheless, despite the progress, many of the problems that preceded the Brown case persist. School desegregation has not progressed in the North as in the South. For example, in 1972 more than 71 percent of northern black pupils attended predominately black schools. Further, dropout rates for minority and lower-class students are at least twice as great on a national scale as for middle-class students. The confrontations, demonstrations, and protests of the late 1960s and early 1970s have subsided; but schools are pretty much as they were, and parents in general are dissatisfied.

The following analysis may help explain why certain problems have persisted, despite the efforts of well-meaning educators, parents, legislators, and others. Federal approaches have been limited in effectiveness, and the need is clear for State Boards of Education to take a stronger role in formulating, implementing, and coordinating state and local programs and actions.

PERSISTENCE OF PROBLEMS IN THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED AND MINORITY CHILDREN

Efforts to improve educational opportunities for the disadvantaged have been motivated primarily by educational egalitarianism — commitment to the principle that all children have a fundamental right to equal educational opportunities. This principle seems simple and basic, and few individuals would dispute it. However, it is subject to many interpretations, and its translation into legal decisions and legislation makes its conflicting implications apparent.

For example, in its decision of **Plessey v. Furgeson** in 1896, the Supreme Court sanctioned "separate but equal" educational facilities for minority children. A contrasting interpretation of this principle was rendered in 1954 when the Supreme Court overturned the **Plessey** decision in **Brown v. Board of Education.** It declared "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." The 1974 decision in **Lau v. Nichols** indicated the Court recognizes that even shared facilities, curricula, teachers, and other resources do not assure that all students are receiving equally *effective* education. From this viewpoint, educational egalitarianism implies that

children have a basic right to educational experiences designed to optimize their academic performance. And this implies that disadvantaged and/or minority children may require unique, supplemental, even "superior" educational resources and opportunities to realize their potential.

Unfortunately, however, even programs that have provided special resources — e.g., substantial extra funds, "expert" consultants, sizeable staff, special equipment — for purposes of desegregation, compensatory education, and enrichment often have not demonstrated substantial or lasting academic benefits for disadvantaged children. Appraisals of early programs concluded the most of them failed to fulfill their hopes and promises.[2]

Many factors have contributed to the failure. The programs were frequently developed and operated in a hostile political climate. Some were hastily conceived, staff were recruited on the basis of availability rather than qualifications, and evaluation of effectiveness was neglected. Occasionally programs were administered or staffed by minority persons who were unprepared for their jobs. More commonly, however, they were designed, administered and staffed by persons who were not attuned to the realities and concerns of the disadvantaged and minorities for whom the programs were operated. Educators with middle-class perspectives frequently failed to recognize nonacademic problems and issues affecting such students.[3] The realities of poverty, family circumstances, sources of pride, the range of interests of the children, their fears and inhibitions, and their points of view were rarely considered as programs were designed and executed. (For example, the very terms "disadvantaged," "compensatory education," "underprivileged," "culturally deprived," and, to a lesser extent, "minority," project a pejorative conception of their environment and culture.)

Since school officials frequently lacked an empathetic understanding of the unique needs, values, and viewpoints of these children, they were unable to understand and resolve the problems which caused attitudinal barriers to motivating and educating them. This lack of understanding and differences in communication styles also prevented educators from adequately involving parents and other representatives in program planning and support.

Even though special resources were widely distributed, the unique problems of many disadvantaged and minority children were largely neglected. For example, migrant children face special obstacles as they move from one school district to another while their parents seek seasonal or temporary employment. Their poverty, health problems, and lack of access to community resources are often more severe than those of disadvantaged children who live permanently within a community. Moreover, 90 percent of the migrant work force in the Southwest is Spanish-speaking. *Children of the Crossroads*, a recent report on migrant programs throughout the United States, indicates that 90 percent of all migrant children never finish high school, and their average educational level is fourth or fifth grade.[4]

There is evidence, however, that some programs have worked when properly planned and administered. Noteworthy is the success of the Career Opportunities Program (COP), a federally funded "compensatory" program for training the disadvantaged to teach the disadvantaged.[5] COP achieved unprecedented success on a national basis in large part because the program recruited trainees from *within* defined disadvantaged communities, employed them as aides within the community schools, provided career training in nearby teacher education institutions, and re-employed them in the schools as they graduated from the teacher-education programs. Not only did these trainees succeed academically, well beyond expected levels, but the pupils in the classrooms showed improved performance on standardized tests.

GOALS AND STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATING DISADVANTAGED AND MINORITY CHILDREN

Consideration of the successes and failures of programs for educating disadvantaged and minority children clearly indicates that commitment of financial and other resources is not enough to assure that all children are being effectively educated. *Quality* education can be achieved only if programs are soundly planned and executed with full consideration of the pupils' community circumstances, cultural environment, and family relationships. A philosophical and conceptual basis for educational programs at the state and local level should be formulated which acknowledge that children of all ethnic groups and socioeconomic levels benefit from educational experiences that respect the diversity of cultural viewpoints and contributions to American society.

Accordingly, we propose the following set of goals as a framework for planning future programs for disadvantaged and minority children, which takes into consideration majority children as well. Under each goal area, programmatic suggestions are offered to indicate alternative strategies for attaining the goal.

• **Minimize racial, cultural and social isolation in schools.** Several studies have documented the adverse effects of racial and social class isolation upon both the academic and social development of disadvantaged and minority children. Research suggests that under proper conditions desegregation generally benefits disadvantaged and minority children, both academically and socially, without adversely affecting academic performance of more affluent majority children. Thus, until educators are able to develop and maintain adequate neighborhood schools for disadvantaged and minority children, desegregation appears to offer the best means to provide equal access to quality teachers, facilities, and programs for these children. Desegregation, in one form or another also represents the primary means by which children with different socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds may experience direct interaction and opportunities to develop interpersonal relationships with one another.

Busing has been the simplest, most immediate and direct, and most commonly used method for achieving desegregation. It has also been the most controversial. Opposition to busing is complexly motivated. On the one hand, segregationists use "busing" euphemistically to resist desegregation in general. On the other hand, opposition to busing may be a manifestation of fear and insecurity on the part of parents who are concerned with the adequacy of the schools their children are attending. A high degree of insecurity results from unfamiliarity with the teachers, the facilities and the neighborhood. Proponents of busing argue that its benefits more than offset the costs and disadvantages. And without such a means to achieve and maintain desegregation, experience indicates that resegregation would eventually take shape along the lines of school district boundaries or attendance zones. Therefore, at least some degree of busing may continue to be employed in the foreseeable future.

Nevertheless, the costs and the controversy over busing compel responsible educators to begin to consider other alternatives to achieve desegregation. The alternatives must be based on careful study of local trends and conditions affecting social class and ethnic composition. Each state should compile statistics and analyze trends in migration and racial composition of all schools within the state. In those school districts which show trends toward segregation or extreme imbalance, program and funding priorities should be established to reverse the trend.

State laws and policies governing school district boundaries and attendance zones should be reviewed and modified to facilitate long-term racial and socioeconomic desegregation of schools. The reputation of a school system or neighborhood school is a major factor in real estate purchases for families with children. Thus fixed, impermeable boundaries may seriously aggravate residential segregation and, in turn, school segregation. Increased residential segregation has been one of the unfortunate consequences of court-ordered desegregation, with or without busing as a factor, in many communities which desegregated on the basis of attendance zones. Therefore, legislation and policies which enlarge school districts, and make attendance zone boundaries more flexible for purposes of short- or long-term desegregation, could minimize both residential and educational segregation and thereby minimize the need for busing.

Depending on local conditions some of the following strategies may prove promising: (1) facilitating student transfer to any school, so long as the transfer does not contribute to racial imbalance within the system; (2) building or developing "alternative" or "magnet" schools and "educational parks" which attract students from throughout the community, e.g., experimental schools with innovative programs and career-oriented schools in which on-the-job training and pre-college programs are coordinated; (3) organizing community-wide organizations and activities such as bands, orchestras, dance groups and dramatic productions; (4) developing special courses, activities, and experiences of high quality and appeal within which multicultural associations are integral, such as community projects; (5) forming clusters of schools for semi-intramural athletics, extracurricular clubs, and specialized classes in which students from several schools work cooperatively over a period of time.

• **Develop programs to involve minority and disadvantaged students.** Desegregation in raw form — mere admixture of children of different ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds—does not assure positive social experiences or academic benefits for the children. Evidence shows that minority children in desegregated schools often feel they are unwelcome, looked down upon by peers and teachers, and discriminated against in grading and disciplinary procedures. As a consequence, they withdraw and remain alienated from the school. Therefore it is essential that educators design programs to constructively involve disadvantaged and minority children in all aspects of school life.

The first step is to provide a means to increase the sensitivity of school administrators and teachers to the concerns and points of view of such children. Various activities may contribute to this objective, including human relations workshops and

continuing discussion of problems with minority students and faculty. The effectiveness of such activities, however, will be enhanced if they are structured to include: (1) open and direct interactions among majority and minority teachers and pupils; (2) guidance to facilitate discussions and to aid in generalizing and interpreting issues, principles, and disparate viewpoints affecting interpersonal relationships; and (3) guidance in interpreting teachers' and students' own viewpoints and feelings relative to ethnically or culturally different persons.

Objective instruments and systematic procedures, such as the delphi technique and environmental assessment surveys[6], may be used to assess the quality of school climate and to identify underlying problems in desegregated schools. Delphi procedures have also been used experimentally to propose solutions to generally recognized problems.

Academic programs may be structured to enhance the involvement of minority and disadvantaged pupils in a number of ways. Curriculum standards and guides, textbooks, and supplementary materials should include significant contributions of minority persons. Children should be given opportunities and supportive materials for individualized study according to their special interests. Disadvantaged children frequently profit, especially in mathematics, vocabulary development and social studies, from opportunities to work with concrete materials related to their immediate environments (as distinguished from purely verbal and symbolic materials).

Nonacademic programs for minority students at the secondary level can also be significant. Factors affecting identification with the school may ultimately determine students' academic performance and level of educational attainment. School authorities should make every effort to insure minority participation in extracurricular activities to enhance identification with the school.

While such efforts must ultimately be implemented at the local level, a State Board can encourage and support such activities by: (1) communicating and interpreting to educators the importance and significance of school climate and extracurricular participation of minority students; (2) supporting the development of model human relations and problem solving programs throughout the state; (3) assigning qualified state supervisory staff to conduct in-service training programs in local systems or state-level workshops; (4) influencing multicultural perspectives in textbooks, curriculum guides and supplementary educational materials; (5) providing technical assistance for assessing school environments with particular concern for participation, perceptions of disciplinary and grading practices, and other sensitive issues affecting minority children; (6) monitoring disciplinary procedures in local systems with particular attention to excessive suspensions or expulsion of minority students; and (7) establishing a human relations division within the state education agency.

- **Involve parents in the educational process.** In a nationwide survey recently conducted by the National Education Association, teachers indicated that parental apathy about their children's education was the most serious problem they faced.[7] If parental apathy is a serious problem for teachers in general, it is doubly critical for teachers of disadvantaged children. Parents of these children typically have had little formal education themselves; they often are unfamiliar with their children's teachers and administrators; they face many obstacles in communicating with school authorities; and they have limited resources for coping with day-to-day problems of subsistence. Although such problems impede efforts to solicit educational support and involvement from these parents, demonstration programs have shown that they *can* contribute substantially to the educational process and that their involvement yields significant educational benefits for disadvantaged pupils.

The Career Opportunities Program and others employing parents of disadvantaged children as classroom aides have shown some of the following benefits: increased individual attention to students, greater sensitivity to students' needs, cultural interpretation for middle-class teachers, and language translation and assistance for language minority children. Bronfenbrenner cites a number of home-based intervention programs which developed maternal interest and direct involvement in the teaching process and which yielded substantial and enduring I.Q. gains among disadvantage children.[8] In general, such parental education and involvement programs can guide parents in supporting their children's education by clarifying roles and responsibilities; demonstrating ways in which parents can assist children with homework; and by familiarizing parents with school personnel, procedures, and activities to facilitate communication effectiveness.

Parent education and involvement programs must, of course, be carried out at the level of the local school and community. But State Boards can facilitate program development in a number of ways. Model parent education programs can be funded, developed and publicized within the state. Positions in the state department of education can be established to provide leadership and coordination among local programs. In many states guidelines need to be developed for employment of non-certified para-

professionals, drawing from an employment pool of parents of disadvantaged children.

- **Organize minority and disadvantaged citizen participation in educational policy and decisions.** Historically, citizens from disadvantaged neighborhoods or minority cultures have not influenced public school policy in any substantial way. As a result, educational goals, plans, priorities and alternatives have unwittingly developed according to the values, needs and concerns of middle-class society. When the disadvantaged child enters school, he steps into a symbol system which does not provide a linkage to his life outside school.

Organizations such as Parent Teachers Associations, citizens' advisory committees, and town meetings generally affect the responsiveness of school authorities to community concerns. Increased political activism has substantially increased the influence of many minority groups. Nevertheless, many boards, commissions and other organizations do not include adequate or effective representation of these viewpoints. State Boards, by virtue of their powers of appointment and/or influence, should assure effective and representative participation by minority persons throughout the spectrum of state educational organizations. It is certainly less difficult now, than say 25 years ago, to identify minority persons with sophistication, expertise and leadership experience to qualify for high-level positions in state advisory commissions and organizations.

A more difficult and perplexing problem concerns involvement of citizens who are disadvantaged by poor economic conditions, lack of education or other handicaps. Frequently such persons are politically inactive, inarticulate, and consequently often reluctant to express their concerns about their children's schools. Therefore, special efforts are necessary to elicit expression of concerns and suggestions from disadvantaged citizens. Such efforts will succeed only under optimal conditions. School authorities must demonstrate receptiveness, patience and responsiveness. Meetings and discussions should be conducted in familiar settings where the people feel free to express themselves. Discussions should be informal, and led by persons who are known and trusted or specially skilled in communicating with disadvantaged persons. With experience, spokespersons may emerge who can effectively communicate the concerns of the disadvantaged.

State Boards can support the development of such involvement through policies or resolutions advocating meetings or hearings in neighborhood settings (e.g., many local school boards rotate their meetings within neighborhood schools). Parents from disadvantaged neighborhoods should be appointed to citizens' advisory groups. Examples of effective programs should be publicized throughout the state. Since attitudes and skills of administrators are crucial in developing a climate that encourages citizen input, special training should be offered. Ombudsmen roles may also be established to nurture liaison with disadvantaged communities.

- **Recruit, educate, and retrain teachers for disadvantaged and minority children.** In the past, when the supply of teachers was critically short disadvantaged children were often taught by inexperienced, minimally qualified teachers. Although some exceptionally dedicated and capable teachers devoted their entire careers to the disadvantaged, more often than not the most qualified and experienced teachers sought better paying jobs in the suburbs where they also enjoyed fewer motivational and disciplinary problems, smaller classes, and other advantages.

At present a surplus of new teachers provides a pool from which better qualified teachers may be recruited and trained for teaching minority and disadvantaged children. More prospective teachers are now expressing interest in careers oriented to education of disadvantaged and/or minority children. Higher educational institutions have acquired greater experience and expertise in training teachers for the disadvantaged through programs such as Teacher Corps; and some institutions are developing new programs in multicultural and bilingual education. Moreover, projects such as the Career Opportunities Program have demonstrated effective means for recruiting and training teachers from disadvantaged backgrounds. Thus, the conditions for improved recruitment and special training of teachers for disadvantaged and minority children appear to be optimal.

These conditions afford State Boards a number of opportunities to contribute to improved training and selection of teachers. For example, in cooperation with the state education agency, higher education institutions can develop or modify *pre-service* teacher education programs to offer training in sociological and cultural characteristics of disadvantaged children, teaching methods and materials, and other language skills. In reviewing teacher education programs for accrediatation, the standards should insure that programs recruit and and prepare trainees from minority and disadvantaged backgrounds. Affirmative action plans developed by most institutions in recent years illustrate some of the techniques and strategies for recruiting minority persons.

State Boards may also develop special recognition for teachers of particular groups of the disadvantaged, such as urban Blacks, Spanish-speaking, Native Americans, migrants, and others in isolated environments. Special qualifications may be recognized by appending an endorsement stamp to the basic certificate in elementary, secondary or special education. Given the needs of disadvantaged children, qualification for the special endorsement stamp may include special training in health and nutrition, sociological and cultural characteristics, bilingual methods and skills, and special instructional techniques.

Development of special training programs and endorsements for teachers of such children must be planned in light of existing staff qualifications and viewpoints, especially if salary differentials are associated with the special qualifications. If no salary differentials are offered, an edge in the competitive job market may operate as one inducement for pre-service teachers to seek a special endorsement even if it is not mandatory for employment. A non-mandatory approach, without an associated salary differential, is presumably easiest to implement initially, although mandatory endorsements with scheduled salary supplements would ultimately have more far-reaching effects in attracting and maintaining specially qualified teachers.

State Boards can also encourage and support school systems to hold *in-service* training workshops to strengthen teachers and other staff currently employed in schools for disadvantaged and minority children. For example, special courses can provide training on community circumstances, adaptability in-service training may also include improving communication skills, improving mutual understanding and appreciation of cultural differences, understanding the specific prevocational and vocational needs of older children, a self-awareness of personal biases and prejudices, techniques for providing the disadvantaged child's physical and mental well-being, improving home-school coordination, and development of resources centers for migrant children and parents.

- **Provide bilingual education.** "Language minority" children are those who speak a non-English native language. Children of Mexican, Puerto Rican, American Indian, and Chinese descent comprise the bulk of language minority children in the United States. The adverse effects of cultural isolation and other educational handicaps, which affect the minority and disadvantaged in general, are further aggravated for these children due to their inability to adequately comprehend and communicate in the language of their instructors and textbooks. Recognizing that lack of English facility virtually precludes effective education of language minority children, the Supreme Court affirmed in 1974 (in **Lau v. Nichols**) that school districts are compelled under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide children who speak little or no English with special language programs.[9]

The mandate to provide equal opportunity for language minority children has engendered philosophical and political debate concerning various interpretations of "bilingual education." Interpretations range from the broadest conceptualization of bilingual training and cultural enrichment for *all* children to narrow conceptions of remedial training in English as a Second Language (ESL). Somewhere between those disparate interpretations are bilingual-bicultural programs, which focus on the culture and environment of the language minority child. These programs provide instruction in the child's first language as well as in English (e.g., initial reading instruction, mathematics, social studies), taking into account the developmental levels of his first and second language capabilities.

Political and ideological disagreements related to the alternative philosophies and interpretations of bilingual education often stem from seeming conflicts between "the language imperatives of nation-building and the deeply-held *[cultural and]* language loyalties of individual ethnic groups."[10] Many State Boards of Education will be faced with the difficult role of balancing or resolving these conflicting viewpoints.

Several states, including Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Texas, have passed laws establishing policies and mandatory programs for bilingual education. Generally, these laws established three-year "transitional" remedial language programs to enable language minority children to perform adequately in the standard educational program. The laws also mandate that annual surveys be conducted by all school districts to determine the number of language minority children; that special language programs be provided where there are 20 or more children of any language group; that parents be notified of their children's placement in such programs; and that language minority children be mixed with English-speaking children in courses such as art and physical education which do not require proficiency in English.[11] Other states, such as Arizona and New Mexico, have provided funds for voluntary programs but have yet to resolve certain policy issues. Presumably, states which have not yet established comprehensive policies or legislation relating to bilingual education will need to develop guidelines for such programs. Model programs and evalua-

tions from established statewide programs should aid other states in legislation, policy, and program development.

Under the authority of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Type B General Assistance Centers (commonly termed "Lau Centers") have been established recently to assist school systems in providing equal educational opportunities for language minority children. These Centers offer six types of assistance: needs assessment (comprehensive surveys of language proficiency needs in their districts), administrative restructuring, curriculum development, community relations, staff training, and other (e.g., establishing evaluation techniques). Since Lau Centers serve regions comprised of several states, State Boards and state education agencies should keep themselves informed about the programs developed within these Centers. They should also develop a role in coordinating interstate or interdistrict bilingual programs with aims of (1) sharing staff, resources, and materials, and (2) minimizing competition or redundancies among programs.

In addition to the issues and strategies discussed, states with language minority children should consider: statewide surveys to determine the scope of need for such programs; development of curriculum guidelines, programs and materials for bilingual education; development of teacher certification standards for bilingual-multicultural teachers (including standards for language proficiency, cultural foundations and bilingual teaching methods); in-service training programs for administrators, teachers and other staff; and financial needs and planning.

- **Develop coherence and continuity within educational programs for migrant children.** School experiences of migrant children are typically characterized by discontinuity, fragmentation and alienation. They must periodically enter unfamiliar schools and encounter new teachers, peers, textbooks, curriculums, etc. Likewise, teachers and school staff are unfamiliar with each child's unique intellectual, academic, language, and social needs and characteristics. Then, before child and teacher become acquainted with one another, the child is uprooted and taken to another new school — in an interminable cyclical process. Therefore, it is essential, though difficult, to develop means to provide for transition, coherence, and continuity within the educational experiences of these children.

Inter- and intra-state coordination among local school systems serving migrant children is imperative. The general migratory trends of seasonal workers are predictable, and knowledge of these patterns may provide opportunity for federal and state intervention in an otherwise debilitating socialization process. Coordinating agencies may design and implement curricula, communications systems for the exchange of student records, special staff training and development programs, mobile services, and liaison staff.

Therefore, School Boards in states which regularly serve migrant children should, in cooperation with other agencies in the region, initiate studies of the status and needs of such children. Within regional networks corresponding to migrant patterns, states then need to agree upon priorities. A general outline has been proposed in the HEW report on migrant children, *Children of the Crossroads*, mentioned earlier. Language training as it relates to oral language development was regarded as one of the highest priority needs. Since the first (and typically only) language of many migrant children is Spanish, bilingual teachers and materials must be prepared. Next to language and reading, health was ranked as second in importance followed by activities related to developing constructive self-images. Of course, these general priorities need to be refined according to regional and local needs, and programs need to be developed accordingly.

To illustrate one effort at coordination of information, a National Migrant Student Record Transfer System has been developed, based in Little Rock, Arkansas, with teletype terminals located in the heart of many migrant paths. The purpose of the system is to make educational and related information available to any school in any of the cooperating states within 24 hours. Using this computerized system, a school official may contact the teletype terminal operator by telephone and request information on a migrant child by name. Critical data which includes birthdate, birthplace, sex, current reading and mathematical levels, and any chronic or critical health condition will be supplied. The child's complete records will be mailed to the school from the data bank in Little Rock the same day it is requested. Unfortunately, data at present is limited to children who have been previously enrolled in a migrant education project sponsored under Public Law 89-750. Nevertheless, this program may serve as a model for State Boards of Education in other areas serving migrant children.

- **Allocate financial resources to improve educational opportunities for the disadvantaged.** Many of the school finance reforms discussed by Dr. Joel S. Berke, in an earlier report in *The Imperative of Leadership* series would improve the financial status of school systems serving substantial numbers of disadvantaged students. Especially helpful are weighting systems for allocating funds according to

educational needs on the basis of test scores or family economic status indicators. Finance reforms would also increase the potential for effectiveness and stability of compensatory education programs. Too frequently in the past, federal funds were terminated just as programs achieved stable organizational structure, adequate professional staff and experience, and effective operational procedures. Program phaseouts often precluded the continuity and follow-up experiences necessary to sustain optimal academic performance.

Of course, priorities for funding the various types of programs will need to be based on careful study of the problems and needs of disadvantaged and minority children in the state. In addition to the scope and seriousness of the needs, allocation must be based on consideration of such factors as alternative sources of funds, both present and projected; cost and effectiveness of alternative programs, and availability, salary levels, and training needs for qualified staff. Pilot programs should be developed and evaluated before funds are committed on a comprehensive statewide basis. Evaluation should continue as programs are expanded, until their effectiveness is fully documented. Especially helpful are assessments which follow the progress of students over a period of years. In addition, measures of the affective as well as cognitive impact of programs are essential, since self-concept and motivational factors may determine academic achievement.

The Role of State Boards of Education

The first report in *The Imperative of Leadership* series by Dr. Russell Meyer[13] indicated how State Boards of Education vary considerably with respect to their power and authority, their relationships with legislative bodies, their staff, and their financial resources. Nevertheless, all Boards are in a position of some influence in improving the quality of opportunities afforded to the disadvantaged. In their official capacities, Boards generally determine or at least influence state educational policy, legislation, professional certification standards, state-level programs, curriculum guidelines and textbook policies, and inter-agency relationships. Unofficially, State Board members are in a position to exert personal influence on state and federal legislation, local school board policies and decisions, and public attitudes and support.

In addition to the particular goals and strategies discussed, which provide a framework for State Board efforts, we offer several general suggesitons as to how State Boards may enlarge and define their roles in shaping educational opportunities for minorities, disadvantaged, and migrants. These suggestions stem from recognition that programs relating to educational, health, social welfare, and other needs of children frequently are fragmented and uncoordinated, resulting in wasteful expenditures and ineffective operation. Since many federally-funded programs for disadvantaged children, as well as state programs, are administered through the state education agencies, State Boards are in a pivotal position to achieve greater coordination at both state and local levels. Problems of desegregation in metropolital areas, for example, frequently affect more than one local school system. These systems may cooperate on programs when they share common interests, but the issue of desegregation frequently places local systems in competition and conflict with respect to finances, staff, and prestige. Thus State Boards should initiate studies and influence the state education agency to coordinate efforts to minimize racial isolation and its harmful effects. As noted previously, Boards may also influence legislation governing school district boundaries and attendance zones in the interests of the state.

Finally, and most importantly, it should be recognized that the basic posture of State Board members, collectively and individually, can influence state and local school officials, legislators, and majority and minority citizen viewpoints. Therefore, as the state's leading educational policy makers, Board members should manifest their commitment to the principle of equal educational opportunity. Their attitudes will ultimately contribute to a climate in which lay and professional educators throughout the state commit themselves to the ideal of effective education for all children.

SECTION III — ACTION ALTERNATIVES

NASBE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
TO STATE BOARDS

State Boards are policy-making bodies with broad constitutional or statutory powers over the public schools. Implicit within their powers and duties is the responsibility for educational leadership. The authors of this paper have outlined a number of goals which State Boards can work toward in carrying out their leadership responsibilities for disadvantaged and minority students. They have also suggested a variety of program strategies which State Boards may utilize in working toward the goals.

Before goals and programs are established, however, any policy-making or decision-making body must have available both current and accurate information and an understanding of the persons or groups to be affected by the decision. Rather than list more alternatives, the NASBE staff lists below a series of questions. The answers to these questions should provide State Boards objective information upon which they can base their policy decisions as they work toward the goals outlined in this paper.

- **Minimize racial, cultural and social isolation in the schools.**

Is the State Board familiar with recent federal court decisions and federal statutes affecting minority and bilingual students?

If there is a possibility of court ordered desegregation within your state, has the State Board been briefed about the legal percepts which will guide the court ordered plan? Are there steps which the State Board should follow in facilitating court ordered desegregation?

Are there school districts in your state which are desegregating their schools without a court order? How are they doing it and can their successful experiences be shared with other school districts in your state? Are State Board policies assisting local school district in desegregating their schools?

Are there exemplary or model educational programs within your state serving minority, disadvantaged or bilingual students? What makes these programs exemplary and do other school districts know about them?

- **Develop academic and non-academic programs to involve the students.**

In school districts where there are significant numbers of minority or disadvantaged students, have special human relations programs been conducted with teachers, students and parents?

What human relations programs have worked best in other school districts serving minority or disadvantaged students?

Is there recent data which compares minority and disadvantaged dropout patterns with the majority population? Does the data provide perspectives on why the students dropout of school?

Is there recent data which compares suspension and discipline statistics between minority and majority student populations? If a disparity exists, what remedial steps have been taken or should be taken?

Does the state education agency have personnel trained to provide specialized assistance to local school districts enrolling significant numbers of minority and disadvantaged students? Is there evidence to indicate that the services are sufficient and appropriate?

- **Involve parents in the educational process.**

Does the state education agency have trained personnel who work with Title I and Johnson O'Malley parent advisory committees? Have their services been recently evaluated by the training recipients?

Have local district building principals assigned to high minority or disadvantaged schools received training in working with minority or disadvantaged parents? Have they received training in how to work with citizen advisory groups?

Do State Board policies encourage or require parent involvement in the classrooms? Does the professional teachers association encourage such involvement?

Is the State Board aware of successful classroom parental involvement models operating within the state or elsewhere? What made the programs successful? Have the models been shared with other school districts?

- **Organize citizen participation in educational policy and decisions.**

To what extent has the State Board been exposed to the cultural similarities and differences of the minority and disadvantaged populations served by the public schools of its state?

Is there data available which indicates the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of minority parents with existing school programs?

What special steps has the State Board taken to seek minority and disadvantaged parents input into State Board policy decisions? What steps have local school boards taken?

- **Recruit, educate, and retrain teachers.**

Have special training programs been developed in your state which prepared minority adults to teach in minority classrooms?

Have special in-service programs been developed to assist non-minority teachers working with minority students?

What is the current availability of minority teachers within your state? What is the current pool of unemployed but specially trained teachers (for teaching minority and disadvantaged children) within your state? Do the teacher training institutions provide lists of such teachers to potential employers?

- **Provide bilingual education for "language minority" pupils.**

Are local school districts aware of the successful bilingual programs currently operating within the United States?

Is the State Board and state education agency familar with bilingual education statutes passed in other states? Is there any evidence that such laws will be introduced within your state?

Has the State Board adopted a policy regarding bilingual education?

How many students within the state fall into the category of bilingual? Is that data available on a district by district basis?

How many school districts within the state are not in compliance with the Supreme Court's ruling on **Lau vs. Nichols**? What assistance is provided these districts to encourage their compliance?

- **Develop coherence and continuity within educational programs for migrant children.**

How many migrant students attend school in your state? What is the pattern of their migration? What special steps have been taken on an inter- and intra-state basis to meet the unique educational needs of migrant students?

Are there model educational programs which are proving to be effective with migrant children which should be utilized in the state?

Has there been any inter-agency cooperation between the schools and health agencies to meet the special health needs of migrant children?

- **Allocate funds to improve educational opportunities for the disadvantaged.**

Does the state's school finance foundation formula adequately recognize the added costs of providing an equal educational opportunity to minority, disadvantaged and bilingual students?

Have any recent studies been completed within the state which correlates the effectiveness of programs for minority and disadvantaged students with their costs?

SECTION IV — APPENDIX

Footnotes

[1] *Twenty Years After Brown: Equal Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, March, 1975), pp. 47, 77-78.

[2] Christopher Jencks and Associates, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Harper, 1972), p. 94. (Also see footnote 107, p. 126.)

[3] Edward A. Nelsen and Norman P. Uhl, "The Social Environments of Segregated and Desegregated Schools," *Journal Supplement Abstract Service* (Ms. No. 430, Summer, 1973), pp. 93-95.

[4] *Children of the Crossroads* (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970)

[5] Wilton Anderson, "Career Opportunities Program: Processes and Evaluation System," *Journal of Research and Development in Education* (Winter, 1972), pp. 31-50.

[6] For example, see Nelsen and Uhl, ibid.

[7] Bernard R. Bartholomew, "Teachers' Instructional Problems," *Today's Education* 63, 1974, pp. 78-80.

[8] Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Is Early Intervention Effective?" in *Influences on Human Development*, ed. Urie Bronfenbrenner and Maureen A. Mahoney (Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press), p. 344.

[9] *A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education* (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Publication 51, May, 1975), pp. 1-2.

[10] Melvin J. Fox and Betty P. Skolnick, *Language in Education: Problems and Prospects in Research and Training* (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1975), p. 5.

[11] *A Better Chance to Learn*, ibid. pp. 213-216.

[12] Joel S. Burke, "Reforming School Finance," *The Imperative of Leadership* Paper No. 2 (Denver: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1975).

[13] Russell W. Meyers, "Educational Governance," *The Imperative of Leadership*, Paper No. 1 (Denver: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1975).

*Annotated Bibliography**

General references:

Deutsch, Martin and Associates, *The Disadvantaged Child: Selected Papers*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

A compilation of papers by Deutsch and other analyzing the social environment for learning, cognitive and language factors in the education of the disadvantaged child, and aspects of race and social class in the education and integration of the disadvantaged child.

Hunt, J. McVicker, *The Challenge of Incompetence and Poverty: Papers on the Role of Early Education*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1969.

Analyzes psychological, social, and political issues relating to the role of experience and the development of competence.

Walberg, Herbert J. and Andrew T. Kopan (eds.), *Rethinking Urban Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Compilation of papers analyzing historical, psychological, sociological, and evaluation perspectives on the problems and solutions underlying the crisis in urban education. Recent journals devoted to reports on educating disadvantaged and minority children:

The Center Magazine, July/August, 1974, pp. 18-73.

Presents working papers from a conference on ethnicity today sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Journal of Research and Development in Education, Winter, 1972.

Special issue devoted to careers for paraprofessionals in the schools; discusses concepts, roles, certification, and evaluation.

Journal of Teacher Education, Winter, 1973, pp. 263-343

Special issue on multicultural education, especially concerned with teacher preparation.

"The Imperatives of Ethnic Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, January, 1972, pp. 265-344.

Discusses basic issues in ethnic education and presents perspectives of various ethnic groups.

"Is School Desegregation Still a Good Idea?" *School Review*, May, 1976.

This forthcoming volume will include articles on busing, racial balance and quality education, housing and schooling, white backlash, and teachers' perspectives.

*The Annotated Bibliography was prepared by Drs. Morrison F. Warren, Edward A. Nelson, and Robert E. Grinder, authors of *Education of Disadvantaged and Minority Children: A Multicultural Perspective.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
BOARDS OF EDUCATION
810 Lincoln Towers
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
303/861-0911